



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/594,103	09/25/2006	Johannes Antonius Maria Hamersma	2004.833US	7265

67706 7590 01/26/2009

ORGANON USA, INC.
c/o Schering-Plough Corporation
2000 Galloping Hill Road
Mail Stop: K-6-1, 1990
Kenilworth, NJ 07033

EXAMINER

BADIO, BARBARA P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1612

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

01/26/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

jill.corcoran@spcorp.com
patents@spcorp.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/594,103	Applicant(s) HAMERSMA ET AL.	
	Examiner Barbara P. Badio	Art Unit 1612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-16, 18-20, 22 and 29-31 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 22 and 29-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-16 and 18-20 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/5/2007</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

First Office Action on the Merits

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 1-16, 18-20, 22 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for a salt of a compound of formula (I), does not reasonably provide enablement for a hydrate of a compound of formula (I). The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

Factors to be considered in making an enablement rejection are summarized as:

- a) the quantity of experimentation necessary,
- b) the amount of direction or guidance presented,
- c) the presence or absence of working examples,
- d) the nature of the invention,
- e) the state of the prior art,
- f) the relative skill of those in the art,
- g) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, and
- h) the breadth of the claims.

In re Colianni, 195 USPQ 150 (CCPA 1977). In re Rainer, et al., 146 USPQ 218 (CCPA 1965). *Ex parte Formal*, 230 USPQ 546 (BPAI 1986).

a) Determining if a particular compound would form a solvate or hydrate would require synthesis and recrystallization of the compound solvate or hydrate using a variety of solvents, temperatures and humidities. The experimentation for solvates or hydrates is potentially open-ended.

b) The specification merely mentions the Applicant's intention to make solvates and hydrates, without teaching the preparation thereof.

c) While the claims recite solvates and hydrates, no working examples show their formation. As stated in Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co., 28 USPQ2d 1190, 1194 (Fed.Cir. 1993):

The specification purports to teach, with over fifty examples, the preparation of the claimed compounds ... However ... there is no evidence that such compounds exist ... [T]he examples ... do not produce the postulated compounds ... [T]here is ... no evidence that such compounds even exist.

The specification shows no evidence of the formation and actual existence of solvates and hydrates. Hence, Applicant must show formation of solvates and hydrates or limit the claims accordingly.

d) The nature of the invention is chemical synthesis of solvates and hydrates, which involves chemical reactions.

e) The state of the art recognizes that the formation, composition and therapeutic activity of solvates and hydrates are unpredictable. The Federal Circuit has recognized a solvate as an example of a polymorph or pseudopolymorph (emphasis added):

Art Unit: 1612

"Polymorphs" are distinct crystalline structures containing the same molecules. These structural differences can affect various properties of the crystals, such as melting points and hardness (e.g., graphite and diamonds are both crystalline forms of carbon) [P]seudopolymorphs are often loosely called polymorphs ... Pseudopolymorphs not only have their molecules arranged differently but also have a slightly different molecular composition. A common type of pseudopolymorph is a solvate, which is a crystal in which the molecules defining the crystal structure "trap" molecules of a solvent. The crystal molecules and the solvent molecules then bond to form an altered crystalline structure.

SmithKline Beecham Corp. v. Apotex Corp., 74 USPQ2d 1398, 1409 (Fed.Cir. 2005).

The same rationale obtains for hydrates; solvates in which the solvent is water. Souillac, et al., Characterization of Delivery Systems, Differential Scanning Calorimetry, pages 217-218 (in Encyclopedia of Controlled Drug Delivery, 1999, John Wiley & Sons, pages 212-227), recognize that different polymorphs of the same drug can have different therapeutic activity (emphasis added):

Because different polymorphic forms of the same drug exhibit significant differences in their physical characteristics, therapeutic activity from one form to another may be different. Studying the polymorphism of a drug and the relative stability of the different polymorphs is a critical part of pre-formulation development.

Further, Vippagunta et al. (Advanced Drug Delivery Reviews, 48 (2001), pages 3-26) state "Predicting the formation of solvates or hydrates of a compound and the number of molecules of water or solvent incorporated in to the crystal lattice of a compound is complex and difficult." See page 18, section 3.4.

f) The artisan using Applicant's disclosure to prepare the claimed solvates and hydrates would be, e.g., an experienced process chemist with at least a BS chemistry degree.

g) Chemical reactions are known as unpredictable. *In re Marzocchi, et al.*, 169 USPQ 367, 370 (CCPA 1971); *In re Fisher*, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). See above regarding the unpredictability of solvate and hydrate formation.

h) The breadth of the claims includes thousands of compounds of the instant formula (1) as well as presently unknown compounds embraced by the terms solvates and hydrates. See MPEP 2164.01(a), discussed supra, justifying the conclusion of lack of enablement commensurate with the claims. Undue experimentation will be required to practice Applicant's claimed invention.

3. Claims 1-16, 18-20, 22 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 recites a "prodrug" of the compounds of formula I as defined by the instant invention. The present specification lacks definition/example of the above term and, thus, it does not convey to the skilled artisan in the art that at the time of filing applicant had possession of the claimed invention.

It is suggested that applicant delete the above-mentioned term from the instant claims.

4. Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 USC 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Among these factors are (1) the nature of the invention, (2) the breadth of the claims, (3) the state of the prior art, (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art, (5) the amount of guidance or direction presented, (6) the presence or absence of working examples, (7) the relative skill in the art and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary. When the above factors are taken into consideration, the examiner's position is that one skilled in the art could not perform the invention commensurate in scope with the instant claim without undue experimentation.

The instant claim is drawn to a method of treating a gynecological disorder by administering the claimed compounds. The present specification provides support by showing the in vitro progestagenic activity of the claimed compounds (see page 35, Example 28).

The state of the pharmaceutical art is such that screening in vitro and in vivo is utilized to determine the desired effect of pharmaceuticals. There is no absolute predictability of pharmaceuticals and, thus, one of ordinary skill in the art would not accept any therapeutic regimen on its face.

Because the pharmaceutical art is unpredictable, it requires each embodiment to be individually assessed for physiological activity. *In re Fisher*, 427 F 2d. 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) indicates that the more unpredictable an area is the more specific enablement is needed in order to satisfy the statute.

Here, the instantly claimed invention is highly unpredictable because the skilled artisan in the art would recognize the differences in the etiology of the gynecological disorders from cancer to bloating to hot flashes etc. and treatment thereof. Additionally, there is no evidence in the art of a single agent that is known to be effective in treating gynecological disorders in general

Therefore, in the absence of a showing of correlation between all gynecological disorders and the effectiveness of the claimed compounds in treating said disorders, one of skill in the art would be unable to fully predict the effect of administration of the claimed compounds in the treatment of the disorders as encompassed by the instant claim.

As stated above, the only guidance given in the present specification is directed to the in vitro progestagenic activity of the claimed compounds, which is minimal. Thus, in order to practice the claimed invention commensurate in scope with the instant claim, the skilled artisan would have to engage in undue experimentation to determine the gynecological disorder(s) treatable by the claimed compounds, with no assurance of success.

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

Art Unit: 1612

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claims 1-16, 18-20, 22 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The instant claims recite a prodrug of the claimed compounds. The present specification lacks definition and/or example of what is meant by "prodrug" and, thus, the metes and bound of the claimed invention is indefinite.

Telephone Inquiry

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara P. Badio whose telephone number is 571-272-0609. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 6:30am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frederick Krass can be reached on 571-272-0580. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1612

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Barbara P. Badio/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1612